



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BT
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,997	11/26/2003	Hans-Peter Hauser	06478.1496	3432
22852	7590	10/18/2005	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			SCHNIZER, HOLLY G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1656

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/721,997	HAUSER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Holly Schnizer	1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 11-35 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

Claims 11-35 are pending and are subject to the following restriction requirement.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 11-29, drawn to factor VIII cDNAs, vectors, host cells, and methods of making the protein, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- II. Claims 30 and 35, drawn to factor VIII proteins, classified in class 530, subclass 383.
- III. Claims 31-32, drawn to methods of treating hemophilia by gene therapy, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- IV. Claims 33-34, drawn to methods of treating hemophilia by administering a factor VIII protein classified in class 514, subclass 2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are independent and distinct, each from the other, because they are products which possess characteristic differences in structure and function and each has an independent utility, that is distinct for each invention and which cannot be exchanged. The cDNA of Group I can be used in the production of the protein or in the development of gene therapy methods. The protein of Group II can be used therapeutically or diagnostically or in methods of making antibodies all of which do not

involve the cDNA. In addition, while a protein of Group II can be made by methods using the cDNAs of Group I, the proteins can also be recovered from a natural source.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of Groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the cDNAs and proteins are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in the appropriate databases which are separate between proteins and DNA. In addition, for those mutations that occur in nature, a reference may only describe the protein isolated from nature and not the cDNA sequence. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups I and II together.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the cDNA may be used in a method of making the protein which is a materially different process than the method of gene therapy of Group III.

Searching the inventions of Groups I and III together would also impose a serious search burden. The inventions of Groups I and III have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification. Moreover, in the instant case a search for Groups I and III is not coextensive. Since the cDNA can be used in methods other than

Art Unit: 1656

treatment, a reference describing the cDNA, for example, in the in vitro production of the protein or in hybridization assays, may not discuss the use of it in methods of treatment.

Inventions I and IV are not related because the product of Group I is not used or otherwise involved in the process of Group IV.

Inventions II and III are not related because the product of Group II is not used or otherwise involved in the process of Group III.

Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the protein of Group II could be used to make antibodies, which is a materially distinct method of using the protein than the method of treatment of Group IV.

Moreover, searching the inventions of Groups II and IV would impose a serious search burden. The inventions of Groups II and IV have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification. In addition, references discussing the isolation of the protein or its use to make antibodies, for example, would not necessarily teach or suggest a method of using that protein in treatment.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). The instant specification does not disclose that the methods of Groups III and IV could

Art Unit: 1656

be used together. The method of gene therapy and the method of treating hemophilia by administering the protein are unrelated because they comprise distinct steps and utilize different products which demonstrates that each method has a different mode of operation. Each invention performs this function using structurally and functionally divergent material. Moreover, the methodology and materials necessary for treatment differ significantly for each of the products used in the method. Thus, each method is different in materials and steps. For these reasons, Groups III and IV are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, the distinct steps and products require separate and distinct searches. The inventions of Groups III and IV have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. As such, it would be unduly burdensome to search the inventions of Groups III and IV together.

Having shown that these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter as defined by MPEP §808.02, the restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP §

821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1656

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Schnizer whose telephone number is (571) 272-0958. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday from 10 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr can be reached on (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Holly Schnizer
October 15, 2005